

1	IN RE:	*	
2		*	TAPE-RECORDED
3	THE APPLICATION OF THE NEW	*	STATEMENTS
4	JERSEY TURNPIKE AUTHORITY FOR	*	FROM MEMBERS OF
5	THE ROUTE 92 PROJECT	*	THE PUBLIC
6	APPLICATION No. 1999-00240-J1	*	
7	- - - - -	-	

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

T R A N S C R I P T of stenographic notes
of the tape-recorded proceedings in the
above-entitled matter, as taken by MARIA GEORGELES,
a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public
of the State of New Jersey.

00002

1 JACK UNDERWOOD: My name is Jack
2 Underwood. Today is May 20th, 2004, and it's
3 quarter of three in the afternoon. I'm not
4 affiliated with any particular group, but I do have
5 a series of strong feelings on the Route 92 plans.

6 As you may gather from some of the specific
7 comments I'll make, and I'll keep them brief because
8 I realize that you have many people that want to
9 comment on this thing, I am very passionately
10 against the plan. And the reason I am is because I
11 think that this is a plan which is designed to favor
12 certain communities at the expense of others, and
13 also, to benefit The Forrestal Center and possibly
14 the New Jersey Turnpike. This will take place at
15 the expense of other communities, one of which I
16 live in, which is Kingston, and also, the taxpayers,
17 who one way or another are going to have to cover
18 the New Jersey Turnpike costs for this project.

19 There is an alternative, as has been stated
20 many times, which is 522. And I really feel that
21 that should be the route that's given priority.
22 Thank you.

23 EDITH NEIMARK: My name is Edith
24 Neimark. This is May 20th at roughly 3:25 P.M. I am
25 speaking for the League of Woman Voters of the

00003

1 Princeton Area, and I will read you my comments.

2 The League of Woman voters of the Princeton
3 Area urges the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to
4 reject the permit application by the New Jersey
5 Turnpike Authority to fill in wetlands for the
6 purpose of building a roadway known as Route 92.

7 The League of Women Voters of the Princeton
8 Area represents seven municipalities in the greater
9 Princeton area, including both the Borough and
10 Township of Princeton, Plainsboro, West Windsor,
11 South Brunswick, Rocky Hill and Montgomery. All of
12 these townships will be affected by the proposal to
13 grant a permit to fill in wetlands for the proposed
14 Route 92.

15 The League of Women Voters has a long-standing
16 position to quote, promote an environment beneficial
17 to life through the protection and the wise
18 management of natural resources in the public
19 interest by recognizing the inter-relationships of
20 air quality, energy, land use, waste management and
21 water resources. End of quote.

22 We endorse land-use policies and procedures
23 and their relationship to human needs, population
24 trends, and ecological and socioeconomic factors.
25 The league feels strongly that this permit to fill

00004

1 in wetlands and the impact it will have on the
2 environment does not achieve optimum balance between
3 human needs and environmental quality.

4 Our reasons follow. One: Route 92 would
5 bisect through one of Middlesex County's largest and
6 most fragile pieces of remaining open land.
7 Thirteen acres of wetlands and three hundred acres
8 of farm land would be destroyed. Route 92 would
9 also cut through a nature preserve, endangered
10 species habitat, and preserved open area. The
11 League strongly opposes any development that
12 compromises natural habitats or degrades fresh water
13 wetlands.

14 Two: The New Jersey State Plan is comprised.
15 Proposed Route 92 bisects an area around Devils
16 Brook designated in a New Jersey State Development
17 and Redevelopment Plan as PA-5. The status New
18 Jersey applies to its most environmentally sensitive
19 areas. According to the state plan, this means that
20 it should have the highest degree of protection from
21 development. Destroying 13 acres of wetlands and
22 devastating open space and farm land is inconsistent
23 with the intent of the State Plan and Redevelopment
24 Plan. The League supports the New Jersey State Plan
25 and does not support its violation or compromise.

00005

1 This area is the site of two -- this is point
2 three. This area is the site of two aquifer
3 recharges from which approximately 50 percent of
4 South Brunswick Township's water supply depends.
5 The ground water flow of these aquifers would be
6 radically altered by the one hundred and three acres
7 of impervious surface and wetlands fill.

8 In addition, the Draft Environmental Impact
9 Study, DEIS, fails to address the increased
10 non-point source pollution, including road salt, to
11 the water shed and water supply, which would be
12 caused by the additional traffic this proposed
13 roadway would generate.

14 Four: The DEIS fails to adequately address
15 the transportation issues for all the areas that
16 will be affected. The League of Women Voters states
17 in its transportation position of 1977 that, quote,
18 the transportation planning process places a high
19 priority on energy conservation and social and
20 environmental costs and benefits. End of quote.

21 The DEIS does not address conservation issues
22 fully, stating that quote, further analysis of
23 public transit operational improvements is
24 recommended. Section two point nine. Does it
25 address the impact -- nor does it address the

00006

1 impacts on all communities within and surrounding
2 the designated area, including abutting communities
3 west of the terminus. Without conservation, social
4 or environmental benefits, we see little to offset
5 the extremely high cost of an estimated four hundred
6 million dollars for this plan.

7 Therefore, the League of Women Voters of the
8 Princeton Area urges the Army Corps of Engineers to
9 reject the application of the New Jersey Turnpike
10 Authority and to continue to promote wetlands
11 protection, open space preservation and sound
12 transportation planning.

13 Sincerely, Edith Neimark, President, Princeton
14 Area League of Woman Voters.

15 CLIFFORD HEATH: My name is Clifford J.
16 Heath. I'm the Senior Vice-President of the New
17 Jersey Alliance For Action. Today's date is May
18 20th, 2004. The time is just about four o'clock in
19 the afternoon.

20 I'm here to testify in support of the Route 92
21 project. The Alliance For Action is a consortium of
22 business and public interest, six hundred strong,
23 made up of consulting engineers, union laborers,
24 contractors, schools, individual counties, towns,
25 hospitals, colleges. It's a very broad-based

00007

1 coalition.

2 My testimony is as follows: The foresight of
3 the New Jersey Legislature in 1948 empowering the
4 formation of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority
5 should be heralded repeatedly by the citizens of New
6 Jersey.

7 The abundant prosperity of our state surely
8 had its genesis in the building of the world's
9 busiest toll road. No sooner than the cutting of
10 the ribbon in late 1950, less than two years after
11 the initial ground breaking, it was already apparent
12 that the first in a series of widening would soon be
13 required.

14 The rapid growth of traffic demanded no less
15 of a response from the Turnpike's engineers, who
16 were guided by the principle of designing and
17 constructing in anticipation of traffic growth, not
18 just in response to that growth. The history of the
19 Turnpike's many widenings during the 1950's, '60's,
20 '70's and '80's, is a reflection of that guiding
21 principle.

22 With the proposed Route 92 project, once again
23 the New Jersey Turnpike can beneficially serve New
24 Jersey by accommodating the traffic growth in
25 Middlesex County. In contrast to the two-year

00008

1 construction timetable in 1950, the Route 92
2 extension, already many years in the deliberation,
3 was authorized by the state legislature in 1992 to
4 be transferred from the New Jersey Department of
5 Transportation to the New Jersey Turnpike. That was
6 twelve years ago.

7 The New Jersey Alliance For Action supports
8 the Route 92 project and commends the Army Corps of
9 Engineers for their comprehensively balanced and
10 supportive Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
11 Thank you.

12 DAVID VILKOMERSON: My name is David
13 Vilkomerson. I live in Kingston, New Jersey. The
14 date is the 20th of May. It is approximately four
15 oh seven. My affiliation is just to represent a
16 member of the community which resides in the
17 Kingston, New Jersey area.

18 I'm not going to go over all the various
19 significant impacts. I'm sure my fellow members of
20 this community, that is the Kingston Community, have
21 talked about what the impact on this historic
22 community will be when a major, major thoroughfare
23 connecting Route 1, which is already impossibly
24 crowded, with the Turnpike, which is frequently
25 impossibly crowded, thereby sucking still more

00009

1 traffic through this area. I of course am urging
2 you not to allow this community, that is Kingston
3 and the surrounding area, to be inundated with
4 traffic as that will result from -- from this
5 project.

6 What I actually want to bring to your
7 attention, and as an urge for perspective, is the
8 experience of almost fifty years ago in New York
9 City. I was watching -- I'm not quite old enough,
10 but I was watching The Ken Burns History of New York
11 City, and there was a whole section describing the
12 impact of Moses, the guy who was building all the
13 important freeways and so forth in Long Island and
14 did a lot for them, when he finally got to New York
15 and wanted to do something called the Lower
16 Manhattan Expressway that was going to create a
17 major thoroughfare between the east of Manhattan and
18 the west of Manhattan, going through the approximate
19 region of Greenwich Village. And he had never been
20 stopped before, but when the people of Greenwich
21 Village realized that this was going to be the end
22 of their community, they rallied and started to have
23 political impact, and was able actually to stop this
24 fellow, who had been successful in all his other
25 road building, for a very good reason. They

00010

1 counterbalanced the need for increased through
2 traffic between the east and west of Manhattan,
3 somewhat similar to the east and west of Middlesex
4 County, by the importance of maintaining a
5 historical area. And indeed, in the Ken Burns
6 Review of New York History, this became a signal
7 event. It became the time when suddenly people in
8 New York recognized the importance of history, the
9 importance of preserving historical areas.

10 Fifty years later, now, we look back at the
11 planning board at that time and congratulate them on
12 their wisdom and insight in preventing the Lower
13 Manhattan Expressway from being built. I'm urging a
14 similar kind of perspective and a similar kind of
15 wisdom to you all. Building in itself, wonderful
16 thing. But when you counterbalance the destruction
17 of area, when you look at the increased misery index
18 of the community for a slightly improved commute for
19 people going through the area, I think that you will
20 understand the wisdom of that New York Planning
21 Board and you should come out with basically the
22 same result: No to 92. Thank you.

23 DOROTHY FRASER: Yes. My name is
24 Dorothy Fraser. Today's date is May 20th, 2004, and
25 the time is just about five o'clock P.M. I am a

00011

1 resident of South Brunswick Township and have been
2 for 43 years. And at this point, watching the
3 township grow the way it has, I don't think the
4 roads or other things have grown along with it. And
5 I totally object to having Route 92 put in. I think
6 it's going to dump the traffic on Route 1. I think
7 it's going to cause tremendous problems. We haven't
8 even widened Route 1 in South Brunswick. We have a
9 congestion there constantly.

10 So at this point I object to it and I don't
11 think we need any more super highways to get anybody
12 wherever they have to go. We want to keep it as
13 rural and as comfortable as possible. Thank you.

14 PAMELA HERSH: Hi. My name is Pamela
15 Hersh. The date is May 20th and the time is 7:42 by
16 now. I am affiliated with Princeton University, and
17 here are my comments. On behalf of Princeton
18 University, I would like to thank you very much for
19 the comprehensive, thorough and balanced Draft EIS
20 that studies the potential impacts of Route 92 on
21 the region.

22 We are very gratified that the conclusions of
23 the report find that the preferred alignment meets
24 the project's goals in providing an east/west link
25 from Route 1 to the Turnpike, significantly

00012

1 improving vehicular mobility and accessibility
2 throughout the region, taking traffic, especially
3 truck traffic, out of residential neighborhoods, and
4 by doing so, improving air quality throughout the
5 area. The alignment does in this manner, that meets
6 state criteria for smart growth because, as the
7 Draft EIS explains, the proposed Route 92 would be
8 unlimited access highway that would not enable
9 linear development along its route.

10 As the University's Director of Community and
11 State Affairs, I represent an institution that has
12 been participating in conversation about the need
13 for Route 92 for several decades. The region's
14 largest private employer and land owner, and a
15 destination for hundreds of thousands and visitors
16 annually, Princeton University has long believed
17 that Route 92 would make an important and positive
18 contribution to the economic viability of the region
19 and the quality of life of those living and working
20 in Central New Jersey. The Draft EIS validates
21 those assumptions.

22 The two hundred and fifty-eight year old
23 university is a truly regional organization with an
24 historic connection to and a tremendous investment
25 in the welfare of the region. We have a very strong

00013

1 commitment to create the best possible environment
2 for living, working and learning. We are pleased
3 that the design of Route 92 from Exit 8A to Route 1
4 has been improved over time. The current alignment
5 yields the most benefits with the fewest number of
6 negatives for the residents, employees and
7 employers.

8 The necessary permits from the Army Corps and
9 the state agencies should be issued as soon as
10 possible so that the completion of this project
11 first discussed in 1938 finally can come to
12 fruition.

13 I'd be happy to answer any questions you might
14 have regarding the University's interest in this
15 project and its longtime support for the roadway.
16 Thank you very much. Sincerely, Pamela Hersh.

17 JOSEPH KREMER: Hi. My name is Joseph
18 Kremer. I'm at 263 Friendship Road, Cranbury, which
19 is part of South Brunswick Township. I have the
20 following questions. Number one: How many projects
21 traditionally does the Army Corps get that just
22 don't make sense? I'm just wondering if you have
23 some type of statistic on that.

24 Does the Army Corps, in the past, design
25 projects even if they are difficult, or does it get

00014

1 to a point where they're so difficult there's
2 something in place that says this no longer makes
3 sense?

4 And the third question I have is, at what
5 point does a potential project no longer make sense?
6 If you have some type of statistic for that.

7 Number four: What guidelines are in place to
8 recognize when a project no longer makes sense?

9 Number five: With such a large amount of
10 wetlands being affected in a rural residential area,
11 how successful can we be at restoring these
12 wetlands?

13 Number six: What percentage of restored
14 wetlands has been successful in the State of New
15 Jersey?

16 Number seven: Isn't there a large percentage
17 of projects in the state where wetlands are restored
18 unsuccessfully?

19 Number -- I think nine: Can you guarantee
20 this large amount of wetlands will be restored fully
21 back the way it was before? Not only for wetland
22 quality, but as far as wildlife quality as well.

23 Number 10: In the event of a tanker spill,
24 gas leak, toxic chemical spill, accident, how are
25 these wetlands going to be protected longterm? What

00015

1 is going to be in place from a design view?

2 Number 11: Wouldn't most people in the state
3 vote to get rid of toll booths?

4 So my question to you, which is number twelve,
5 toll booths are something the public doesn't want.
6 So why are we basing a new highway on more toll
7 booths?

8 Number 13: In this present day, how are toll
9 booths constructed so that -- I'm sorry. In the
10 present day, how are toll booths constructed so that
11 pollution, noise, and the environment are better
12 protected?

13 And number 14: How are toll booth collectors,
14 the actual people, better protected? Thank you.
15 And those are my comments.

16 MARGARET KATH: My name is Margaret
17 Kath. Today is May 20th, 2002 -- 2004. It's around
18 eight fifteen, and I'm against Route 92. We have
19 fake wetlands behind my house that aren't working
20 out, that are not being taken care of. It's dying.
21 There's horrible things going on in the woods.
22 There's all these little bug problems because these
23 are things that are not natural. They tried to
24 create fake wetlands to make up for the good
25 wetlands that are destroyed. So they had to do that

00016

1 behind my house because of Route 522.

2 And now you want to put in Route 92 with this
3 elaborate bridge that is going to be surrounding me,
4 and I moved out to the middle of nowhere so that we
5 can be left alone and not have to look at any of
6 these things that we're going to have to look at now
7 as well.

8 I think it's a big mistake. The mosquito
9 control department thinks it's a big mistake. They
10 don't like these fake wetlands and it's killing
11 trees left and right because they have these
12 diseases and everything else. I really think we
13 shouldn't have Route 92.

14 GRETCHEN OVERHISER: Hi. This is
15 Gretchen Overhiser and --

16 RON OVERHISER: Ron Overhiser.

17 GRETCHEN OVERHISER: And our kids
18 Marshall, three years old, and Elliot, six month
19 old, Overhiser. And it is --

20 RON OVERHISER: It's May 20th at eight
21 fifteen P.M.

22 GRETCHEN OVERHISER: And --

23 A VOICE: We're residents of Kingston.

24 GRETCHEN OVERHISER: And I'm the
25 Co-chair of the South Brunswick Historic

00017

1 Preservation Ordinance Task Force, as well as the
2 previous Program Director of Preservation New
3 Jersey.

4 And I hadn't intended to say anything tonight.
5 I knew the list would be long and I was glad to have
6 this opportunity on a tape recording, because as I
7 drove home the other day up Academy Street, which is
8 off of Route 1, to my house, I waited in traffic for
9 25 minutes and watched all the cars with all the
10 noise and all the pollution go up our street, go
11 through our little charming community, and up until
12 then I thought, you know, I'm not going to say
13 anything because we probably -- we might not live in
14 this area for that long. And then I thought, you
15 know what? This is wrong. It's -- it's wrong for
16 small communities like this in New Jersey. It's
17 wrong for my children to grow up seeing big
18 corporations able to take over roads, roadways,
19 small communities, at whim.

20 And I'm concerned that what has not been
21 addressed in the Army Corps of Engineers' report is
22 the impact that this road will -- that Route 92 will
23 have once it ends and dumps cars on Route 1. Surely
24 you can't imagine that cars are going to stop --
25 that's Elliot -- that cars are going to stop driving

00018

1 once they reach Route 1. Many of these cars will
2 use Route 92 as a shortcut into Princeton. And the
3 only roads that they can use as access are the roads
4 through Kingston, through Academy Street, through
5 Laurel Avenue and Heathcote Roads in Kingston. It
6 spells the ruin of one of New Jersey dwindling
7 resources, which is -- which are their small
8 villages. That's a shame. I hope that that will be
9 addressed through Route 92 -- or uhm, through -- you
10 know, through the financial report.

11 I also am concerned with the impact on our
12 green belt in Kingston, which is a resource for all
13 of South Brunswick and indeed, Middlesex County.
14 I'm concerned that that hasn't been addressed.

15 I'm concerned about the impact on our water
16 supply in South Brunswick. I'm concerned that as
17 well, that that has not been fairly and adequately
18 addressed in the Economic Impact Statement. And
19 Ron, do you have anything else to add?

20 RON OVERHISER: I'll just echo your
21 comments, Gretchen. It's -- it's -- it's -- this is
22 an unnecessary development in the state. It doesn't
23 make any sense. And it's things like this that are
24 causing us to rethink our residence, not only in
25 South Brunswick, but in the State of New Jersey in

00019

1 general. And certainly, the leadership of this
2 state, which is obviously going against the grain of
3 what the citizens are demanding.

4 GRETCHEN OVERHISER: And I think it's a
5 shame because I think what you'll find is that -- is
6 more and more citizens find their quality of life
7 negatively impacted.

8 RON OVERHISER: It is deteriorating
9 rapidly.

10 GRETCHEN OVERHISER: Yeah. You'll find
11 more and more taxpayers who are less and less
12 willing to live in New Jersey and live in these
13 communities, and that'll be -- that'll be a real
14 shame for -- for New Jersey in the end. Thanks very
15 much.

16 SEAN KATH: Hi. My name is Sean Kath.
17 I live at 74 Rouland Road in Cranbury. The date is
18 May 20th, 2004, approximately eight P.M.

19 I have no specific political affiliation. I
20 do have a background in mathematics, specializing in
21 flow technics. I have a business which is located
22 both in East Brunswick and Lawrenceville, New
23 Jersey. I drive the Route 1 corridor every day. I
24 also live in what will be -- what is now one of the
25 most beautiful places in Middlesex County, if not

00020

1 the only beautiful place in Middlesex County left,
2 and will soon to be apparently have a fifteen foot
3 raised highway running through it that I get to have
4 a view of from my backyard.

5 But nevertheless, when I drive up and down the
6 Route 1 corridor every day, probably two or three
7 times a day from East Brunswick to Lawrenceville and
8 back, it is absolutely inconceivable to anyone that
9 drives that corridor that a major conduit that is
10 going to let itself out right at Forrestal Village's
11 gate is going to improve traffic in any way, shape
12 or form on Route 1.

13 The people that are commuting to and from the
14 area that this road exits at are not commuting from
15 a distance of the west. I don't care what your
16 traffic studies say. I have many clients. We have
17 financial planning, both individual and corporate
18 clients in this area. The people that work in the
19 Princeton area commute from Hamilton or from the
20 Brunswicks. They do not come east to west. You are
21 effectively just creating a long and elaborate and a
22 ridiculously expensive driveway for Forrestal
23 Village.

24 And let's face it, when these traffic
25 patterns -- when this road was first proposed

00021

1 thirty, forty years ago, these traffic patterns were
2 not what they are today. They were -- this road was
3 proposed back then to provide an easy access from
4 the Turnpike to Forrestal Village. That's the
5 purpose of the road at this point and its sole
6 purpose. It is going to create an absolute horrible
7 traffic nightmare in the middle of Route 1, which is
8 arguably already a traffic nightmare.

9 Put aside the environmental impact, the
10 runoff, the fact that we in today's date and age
11 cannot take -- can take the last pristine, pristine
12 area in Middlesex County, which is so overpopulated
13 and overdeveloped and run a road right through the
14 middle of the wetlands, right through the middle of
15 a preserve, through the middle of the Plainsboro
16 Preserve, to run a roadway that is then going to
17 pollute, to have runoff, to have noise, to have
18 lights, and you know as well as I know, unforeseen
19 effect on the wildlife and flora and fauna of that
20 area. It's an unconscionable act and it's an act
21 that is politically motivated, and in any way, shape
22 or form needs to be stopped.

23 Guys, this is just wrong. Thanks.

24 DIANE LEONARD: My name is Diane
25 Leonard. I live in Kendall Park. I'm Chairperson

00022

1 of South Brunswick Shade Tree Commission. Today is
2 Thursday, May 20th and it is quarter to nine in the
3 evening.

4 And I just want to add my support to the
5 statements made by the South Brunswick Environmental
6 Commission in opposition to 92 for the reasons they
7 stated. And also I support the resolution that was
8 passed by our Township Council and read today by
9 Deputy Mayor, Carol Barrett.

10 Please do not approve this road. It's a
11 boondoggle. A lot of money for people who will not
12 use it because they're not going to pay the tolls.
13 So vote no 92. Thank you very much.

14 BRUCE ALLEN: This is Bruce Allen on
15 May 20th at nine forty-three. I'm a citizen of
16 Griggstown, New Jersey. I want to talk about the
17 plans for I-92. I think it's a really, really bad
18 idea because it will really provide little benefit
19 for traffic flow. The primary benefit probably
20 would be to Princeton University, who is developing
21 areas that were intended for schools rather than
22 private residences, and also for their commercial
23 facilities.

24 So why do we need to benefit an organization
25 like that when there's public citizens that will

00023

1 have an adverse affect from this road. The 92 plan
2 is going to link to Laurel Avenue, Ridge Road/Laurel
3 Avenue area and then into Canal Road, which is
4 already an overstressed high -- road. It's a
5 two-lane road that comes to the Griggstown Causeway
6 where there's a one-lane bridge and links up to
7 River Road in Montgomery Township. This is an
8 overstressed corridor with traffic.

9 In one year I had five accidents in my front
10 yard. It's -- it's -- an amazingly dangerous road
11 to travel with excessive speed limits for the nature
12 of that road. It would hook straight up to this so
13 you're going to increase the traffic on an already
14 overstressed road which is next to the canal, and
15 the canal is a water shed for Central New Jersey.
16 So you're going to add traffic along a water shed,
17 uncontrolled, and it's going to -- you know, have a
18 devastating affect on our water supply.

19 The other issue is this is an historic
20 district where George Washington marched his troop.
21 He stayed at multiple of the local houses along the
22 road that's actually going to connect to I-92,
23 including Rockingham, he stayed at a house in
24 Griggstown and he visited the Honeymen House, which
25 is on this route also. And you know, for an

00024

1 expansion of this road you'd have to destroy these
2 historic sites.

3 So it just doesn't make sense for this small
4 section of highway, which truckers probably won't
5 even use because of the toll. And what industry
6 connects from the Princeton Forrestal Center to --
7 you know, the Turnpike except for Princeton
8 University? So please block this from -- from being
9 developed.

10 LLOYD GEORGE: My name is Lloyd George.
11 Last name is spelled G-e-o-r-g-e. Today is
12 Thursday, May 20th, 2004 at about nine forty P.M.
13 At this point much has been said. I have very
14 little to add.

15 I want to connect with two points that were
16 made and then speak more philosophically about the
17 changing of scenarios, between the scenario that
18 existed in the structure of life fifty years ago to
19 what exists today.

20 And the two points that were made that I want
21 to connect with are number one, a point that was
22 made by the gentleman from South Brunswick, that the
23 current intention for Route 92 is a 20th century
24 antiquity. And the other point that I would like to
25 connect with is the estimate of well in excess of

00025

1 four hundred million dollars, perhaps even a billion
2 dollars, by the time this project would be
3 completed.

4 Approximately fifty years ago, obviously in
5 the 1950's, under President Eisenhower, there was
6 conceived an Interstate Highway Network nationally
7 that would facilitate the mobility of military
8 vehicles and troops, and also the public. Smart
9 planning would have ensured that that were completed
10 and that vision were accomplished during the 1960's
11 and the 1970's as President Eisenhower and his
12 administration had intended. Unfortunately,
13 politics got in the way of some of those and
14 interrupted. For example, Interstate 95 and what
15 would have been a Route 92 connecting 206 with the
16 New Jersey Turnpike.

17 What has happened is development, development
18 of the Route 1 corridor, development of farmlands
19 for housing, for commercial structures and so forth,
20 much of which didn't exist then. The scenario gap
21 that I want to describe is a picture of the
22 structure of life at that time versus the structure
23 of life at this time.

24 There was a comment made at the very beginning
25 of this evening's hearing looking for the owner of a

00026

1 Volkswagen. Well, fifty years ago a Volkswagen
2 Beetle was referred to as a -- (Inaudible).
3 Today -- today all the Volksses are very commonplace.

4 Fifty years ago we read about men on the moon
5 through Jules Vernon. We've landed men on the moon
6 multiple times. Fifty years ago maps were free and
7 we labored over route planning. Now we get them off
8 the Internet and you can buy a GPS system for your
9 own car at Best Buy.

10 Fifty years ago people worked for corporations
11 eight to five, eight to six or nine to five and
12 expected to work there for life and retire at age
13 fifty -- 65 or 66. That does not exist today.
14 People are forced to retire early. Businesses are
15 based in the homes. People do not even have to
16 travel to generate revenue producing work. The
17 telecommunication phenomenon is still in flux and
18 still evolves.

19 Fifty years ago people would get to work by
20 driving their car. Today they may walk, they may go
21 to the basement, they may go to the office next
22 door, they may drive some place other than their
23 normal place of business because of multi-location
24 work or they may telecommute. Fifty years ago we
25 weren't considering mass transit a serious option

00027

1 because of the reliance on the automobile. Today it
2 is. Fifty years ago there was a forty hour work
3 week expectation with some overtime, and as I said,
4 eight to six, nine to five. Now we have flex time.

5 Fifty years ago is the basis for which most
6 planning models have evolved. The planning model
7 that was used to calculate the need for Route 92 is
8 rooted in the past. This is not unique to this
9 particular model. All models are rooted in past
10 experiences. And to the extent that we haven't
11 experienced the future, we typically as planners
12 make assumptions.

13 My concern is that the mind set and the
14 structure of life that existed fifty years ago that
15 identified and spoke the need for Route 92 is
16 radically different today. The structure of life is
17 radically different today. The forces at play are
18 radically different today. And I must question the
19 fundamentals on which the model is built and the
20 assumptions and the reliability of the assumptions.
21 And I should think that all the officials that are
22 looking at this plan would want to seriously
23 consider that as well.

24 This is not a trivial question. Error in the
25 modeling caused us to miss the planet Mars entirely

00028

1 with a space shot a few years ago. Billions of
2 dollars wasted. Failures of intelligence have
3 allowed us to -- have caused us to hit wrong targets
4 in combat with devastating consequences. The
5 fundamentals of the planning model and assumptions
6 are not trivial.

7 As to the estimate, if my father-in-law were
8 here today, he would have taken four hundred million
9 and multiplied it times three. One point two. His
10 estimates have always been solid. I wish he were
11 alive today to testify personally.

12 My point is, whether the road should be built
13 or not built, I do not know. But what I am
14 suspicious of is that the fundamental foundation on
15 which the model and its assumptions are placed, and
16 the situation that we face today and what we are
17 ignorant of the future should -- must raise a
18 question as to the feasibility technically,
19 economically and environmentally and humanly as a --
20 from the development that has occurred over the last
21 several decades justified by the expenditure of one
22 point two billion dollars. This is a trade-off
23 issue. What about bridges? What about the
24 homeless? What about education? What about the
25 deficit? So that's my point.

00029

1 Seriously question the fundamentals of this
2 plan and consider the options that have been
3 articulated so eloquently by others -- others giving
4 testimony tonight. Thank you.

5 CLAUDIO MAPELLI: Hello. My name is
6 Claudio Mapelli. The spelling of the first name is
7 C-l-a-u-d as in David i-o. Last name, M like Mary,
8 a-p like Peter e-l-l-i. I'm a resident of
9 Plainsboro, New Jersey. My address is 8 Silvers
10 Lane, Plainsboro, New Jersey, 08536.

11 I'm making this statement on May 20th, 2004
12 as part of the Army Corps of Engineers' hearing
13 about Route 92. And so my statement is directed to
14 the attention of the Army Corps of Engineers, that
15 regulatory branch, the Route 92 DIS -- I'm sorry,
16 DEIS, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 1937, New York, New
17 York, 10278-0090.

18 Dear Sir or Madame, I would like to voice my
19 strong opposition to the construction of Route 92
20 for the following reasons. Number one: The road is
21 not needed. Many alternatives are possible that
22 should be considered, including those proposed by
23 the EPA. In its most recent configuration, the road
24 is a travesty of the original Route 92 and cannot
25 fulfill the original goal of connecting the New

00030

1 Jersey Turnpike with Routes 1, 206 and Interstate
2 287.

3 Number two: The road will compromise
4 environmentally sensitive areas, especially
5 including the Plainsboro Preserve, to which I live
6 near. It would create conditions for even more
7 sprawl and uncontrolled development, especially
8 along the Route 1 corridor. To think that a major
9 roadway like Route 92 would reduce or divert traffic
10 anywhere in its vicinity is to be ill-informed and
11 at best, naive. Route 92 would increase traffic
12 significantly, especially on Route 1 and on local
13 roads, which would be used by truckers to avoid
14 Turnpike tolls.

15 Number three: The Route 92 project makes a
16 mockery of Governor McGreevey's efforts to reduce
17 urban sprawl and curb development in New Jersey.
18 The real solution to our traffic problems is to
19 improve our mass transit infrastructure. This in
20 turn would create better job -- better jobs,
21 permanent jobs, better jobs than the jobs that would
22 be created, only temporarily, by the Route 92
23 project.

24 Number four: Route 92, which should be better
25 named the New Jersey Turnpike/Forrestal Connector,

00031

1 is a project of special interests who have an
2 absolute disregard of the public interest.

3 I urge the Governor, our elected officials,
4 our legislators and the Army Corps to stand up to
5 the special interests and say no to sprawl and say
6 yes to clean air, yes to clean water and yes to a
7 better quality of life. Thank you.

8 (Whereupon, this marks the end of tape
9 1 and the beginning of tape 2.)

10 JERRY KEENAN: My name is Jerry Keenan.
11 I'm a resident of East Windsor Township, 28
12 Pinehurst Drive. It is -- today is May 20th. I'm
13 here to speak at the early edition of the hearings.
14 And as an East Windsor resident, I am looking
15 forward to the construction of this road. I am sick
16 and tired of having to cross east and west -- east
17 to west and then back west to east to get back to
18 work.

19 There are no good routes to go right now. 522
20 as everyone knows is a disaster. Any other choice
21 you can come up with is not only not efficient, but
22 also very dangerous for children in the area. There
23 are school buses, there are homes along the way, and
24 I am very looking forward to the construction of
25 Route 92. And I call on the interested parties to

00032

1 put together plans as quickly and as efficiently as
2 possible so we can see the construction of this road
3 begin and be completed. Thank you very much.

4 GEORGE HENRY: My name is George Henry
5 Tate, Jr. The date is May the 19th. The time is
6 two fifteen. Affiliation, myself, I'm a resident of
7 South Brunswick Township. Comments, I'm for the
8 I-92 express road. I feel that the Township and the
9 people that are attending the thing here at the
10 hotel are bussed in and they're part of the
11 entourage that's related or people that's involved
12 with the politicians, whether republican or
13 democrat, it makes no difference. They got a select
14 group that runs the Township and that's it. They're
15 not interested in any kind of improvement, roads or
16 nothing else. They want to do what's convenient for
17 them.

18 We need something done with the roads. The
19 I-92 is best believed that it would relieve the
20 traffic and the congestion. That's great, but
21 there's other problems, too. You know, small roads,
22 DOT problems. There's a lot of traffic. There's a
23 lot of things that needs to be done. And this thing
24 has been going on for years, and it really needs to
25 be adhered to. So that's about it. Thank you for

00033

1 your time. That's about it. Did it sound all
2 right?

3 JOHN BULMER: John Bulmer, Local 825
4 Operating Engineers. I'm a business agent in Mercer
5 and half of Middlesex County. I'm in favor of
6 project 92. The traffic on this Route 1 is terrible
7 and it does need to be addressed. The job needs to
8 be done real soon. All I get is complaints on it.
9 That's it.

10 JOSEPH KOWALSKI: Okay. Only hold this
11 when it's ready. My name is Joe Kowalski. It's the
12 20th of May, nineteen -- I'm sorry, 2004. It's two
13 forty-five in the afternoon. I'm the Chairman of
14 the Hopewell Township Mayor's Task Force on Traffic
15 and Trucking. That's in Hopewell, New Jersey. My
16 address is 30 Pleasant Valley/Harbourton Road in
17 Titusville, New Jersey.

18 And my comments are that I am asking you to
19 reject the Turnpike Authority's proposed Route 92
20 extension to Route 1 near Princeton and Kingston.
21 Route 92 is supposed to remove traffic from local
22 roads, but it's common sense that 92 will just
23 attract enough traffic to the local roads and to the
24 west of Route 1.

25 The estimate of adding one thousand vehicles

00034

1 to terminate at Routes 1 will amplify the already
2 congested region, including as far west as Hopewell
3 Township, East Amwell, West Amwell and Lambertville.
4 This proposal appears to be to favor the commercial
5 development at the expense of lowering the quality
6 of life and increasing traffic grid lock in the
7 region. An Army Corps of Engineer DES even states
8 these historic communities in the area would get
9 more trucks if Route 92 is built.

10 Also, truck drivers wouldn't likely use a toll
11 road when they drive for free on nearby local roads,
12 like County Road 522. In fact, a lot of the traffic
13 problems caused by trucks on local roads are because
14 truck drivers avoid the high tolls on New Jersey
15 Turnpike. Route 20 -- Route 92 violates the
16 McGreevey Administration Policy of Fiscal
17 Responsibility and Smart Growth. Rather than
18 approving the roads that already have, 92 would cut
19 through a nature preserve, wetlands and endangered
20 species, habitats and open space and farmland.

21 The cost is enormous. Four hundred million
22 estimated in 1993. That's a decade ago. It
23 probably would be much higher in reality.

24 An east/west connection to Route 1 and 95
25 already exists just parallel a few miles south of

00035

1 the proposed 92. Extending County Road 522 to the
2 Turnpike would also improve the flow of east/west
3 traffic with much smaller impacts than 92. I
4 frankly don't think it's even necessary. The money
5 out for Route 22 would be better -- 92 rather, would
6 be spent much better to widen and remove the signals
7 from Route 1. This money would be better spent on
8 repairing and improving roads or bridges we already
9 have and increasing public transfer around Route 1.
10 We can do better than 92. We need to start with a
11 fair community based resolution process that works
12 for the whole region, not to favor some special
13 interest or commercial development groups.

14 The Route 92 DIES -- DEIS makes no mention of
15 community involvement and the decision process. It
16 is the community must live with whatever is built
17 for decades in life on and to come.

18 Please reject the Turnpike's proposal of
19 alignment of 92, and instead, use our money on
20 transportation projects that make sense to the
21 community, the environment and to the taxpayers of
22 New Jersey. Thank you.

23 A VOICE: Yeah. It's going. That's
24 why I asked you to do that. And then I'm going
25 to -- I've got your card right over here.

00036

1 A VOICE: What's the date?

2 A VOICE: Five twenty.

3 VANESSA SANDOM: Thank you. My name is

4 Vanessa Sandom. I'm Mayor of Hopewell Township.

5 It's May 20th. It's around three -- what time is

6 it? Three o'clock. I have to do this correctly.

7 Three oh six.

8 I want to put into the record a resolution

9 that Hopewell Township passed on May 20th, and I

10 will simply read the end of it where we renew our

11 opposition formally to the construction of Route 92

12 in its present alignment. And we refer the Army

13 Corps of Engineers to Hopewell Township Resolutions

14 99-96 and 00-32 that also are in opposition to the

15 construction of Route 92. The resolution we just

16 passed a couple of weeks ago is 04-157. I'm going

17 to leave that here on the record.

18 I also have a number of questions that I would

19 like answered. I understand that this highway will

20 transect the wetland creating a hazard for wildlife

21 on the ground and in the trees. I'd like to know if

22 this plan is -- if the road will be elevated over

23 the entire wetland. It's possible and more than

24 likely that this will have a negative impact on

25 birds and other nesting birds on the ground as well.

00037

1 I'm very concerned about the nesting bald
2 eagles in the vicinity of Carnegie Lake that have
3 been spotted in Sondeck Park within shouting
4 distance of the proposed 92. Nesting bald eagles
5 are federally endangered, and you, the Army Corps,
6 must take this into account when finalizing your
7 EIS.

8 Also, we would like to -- Hopewell Township
9 would like to ask the Army Corps for research, to
10 research the impact of toxic runoff on the
11 underground aquifer that lies under proposed Route
12 92. This should be thoroughly researched by you and
13 your experts. It's not currently in the study.

14 Additionally, most homes along the route rely
15 upon wells and septic systems. So we need to know
16 what impact that would have on those homes. And
17 finally, will groundwater levels be changed by
18 construction, thereby affecting the wells public as
19 well as private, and the septic?

20 Those are my comments. I'm at (609)737-9104.
21 Again, I'm Mayor of Hopewell Township on May 20th.
22 Thank you.

23 MING LING HAH: Okay. My name is Ming
24 Ling Hah. My -- I live in just Route 1, on the
25 Ridge, the corner. I was in that address since

00038

1 1978. So I watch all the traffic almost 24 years.
2 So at the beginning when I drive from New York to my
3 address, only take it -- from Queens, only take one
4 hour and five minutes. Now take me four hours if I
5 want to go to Queens, the same place.

6 So I watch all the accident. I was in the
7 corner, so I watch it. Route 1 and the Ridge Road,
8 that has lot of accidents sometimes that go to the
9 wall. Some -- the truck hit the people, fly in the
10 sky. I was -- I had to be witness. So now the
11 traffic get so heavy, when I go to train station
12 pick my husband up, and I cannot even make a turn
13 from the other side to this side. Either to reverse
14 or to go all the way behind me in Kingston over
15 there come here, come to my address. So the traffic
16 is very, very terrible.

17 When I go down Wal-Mart, sometime taking me --
18 travel always take me at least -- you know, thirty
19 minutes. The traffic just like now sometimes
20 compare New York, I think it's more heavy than New
21 York. When you go to Manhattan everywhere, that
22 traffic is terrible. And like Route 1, Ridge Road,
23 the corner, and the water, they keep building, so
24 many people move in, the South Brunswick Township
25 and the other, oh, the move, the residents so many.

00039

1 And the traffic is very, very terrible.

2 So I want Turnpike. That's good for
3 everybody. I living in here. Most people, Township
4 people against because they living far away. They
5 don't care. I don't know why they went against.
6 They never see the traffic. They're far away from
7 Highway 1 and they don't know. I'm the one know.
8 24 years I watch everything. Tell you the truth, we
9 really need I-92. Really, really need I-92.

10 But why in the meeting room all the people
11 talk from South Brunswick, they're all living far
12 away. At least -- I think most people living five
13 or ten miles far, they never see the traffic. So
14 you know, when you got a lot of people you need the
15 room.

16 I guarantee you they had a water floor,
17 everything. That's a dangerous corner, danger how
18 we're going from South Brunswick Township to the
19 Sand Hill Road over there down to the Plainsboro.
20 Thank you. My name is Ming Ling Hah. Thank you.

21 KATHLEEN SNEEDSE: My name is Kathleen
22 Sneedse. Today is May 20th, 2004. It is three
23 forty in the afternoon. I am against Route 92. I
24 have lived in the Princeton Collections since 1985.
25 I work on Route 1, 3490 U.S. Route 1, and I don't

00040

1 think that 92 is going to help. I think it's just
2 going to make it worse. So please do not do this.
3 Thank you.

4 SANDRA SHAPIRO: My name is Sandra
5 Shapiro. S-h-a-p-i-r-o. Today is May 20th, 2004.
6 The time is three fifty-five. I'm affiliated with
7 West Windsor Citizens for Transportation
8 Alternatives. I come to speak about Route 92, and
9 in South Brunswick Township, I do not believe that
10 it would be a --

11 A VOICE: Excuse me, ma'am. You can
12 pause it.

13 SANDRA SHAPIRO: I'd like to voice my
14 opposition to Route 92 as currently proposed. I was
15 involved in the round table for the Penns Neck area
16 DEIS as a representative of West Windsor Citizens
17 for Transportation Alternatives.

18 The Route 1 -- Route 92 funds could be used
19 instead to look at other transportation modalities
20 to relieve the -- the proposed Route 92 calls for
21 the relief of congestion, improve mobility, minimize
22 impacts on communities. All of these could be
23 achieved by other modes, by a commute options
24 package to encourage car pooling, to charge for
25 parking in office parks.

00041

1 Who are we improving mobility for? The best
2 way to improve mobility is to look at these other
3 modes. There hasn't been enough planning for
4 alternative methods of travel, nor has there been
5 enough planning for -- to encourage more transit of
6 moving goods.

7 One objection that I have would be the number
8 of trucks that this will generate. I understand
9 there will be more -- that there will be more need
10 for moving of goods and services because of the
11 ports and the warehousing at route -- at Exit 8-A of
12 the Turnpike. However, if there were other
13 modalities for moving those goods, such as on
14 trains, that would help tremendously.

15 I have had the privilege of twice sighting a
16 bald eagle near the D&R Canal in Plainsboro. The
17 nest is apparently nearby and we can all delight in
18 the return of endangered and threatened species to
19 Central New Jersey. This is because of an
20 encouragement in best management practices of the
21 environment. And this new proposed roadway would
22 not do that. It would destroy many acres of
23 wetlands.

24 I am concerned it would pollute the recharge
25 area, the smallest and most vulnerable aquifer in

00042

1 the state. It would endanger dozens of scenic and
2 historic communities, destroy green acres, lands in
3 Plainsboro adjacent to the New Jersey Audubon
4 Society Preserve. It would fail to relieve traffic
5 problems in a community which bear its burden. It
6 would -- (Inaudible) -- homes with heavy truck
7 traffic and be a publicly funded roadway to
8 encourage sprawl in the community.

9 I note that the roadway at Forrestal
10 Village/College Road is four-way -- four lanes wide,
11 but it has never been up to capacity in its usage.
12 I note that Route 522 has been built and it, with
13 slight modifications, could be used to relieve some
14 of the traffic.

15 We also should increase the -- Route 1 to
16 encourage people to use that way. We must use our
17 dollars wisely, promote fiscal responsibility in New
18 Jersey and get the State of New Jersey out of the
19 business of subsidizing sprawl and rather into the
20 business of preserving land. Thank you very much.

21 LEONARD MILLNER: My name is Leonard J.
22 Millner. M-i double l-n-e-r. Today is May 20, two
23 oh oh four. The time is now four fifty-three P.M.

24 I'm a former Mayor of East Windsor Township,
25 New Jersey. I was very -- that was in 1982 and

00043

1 1984. And at that time -- excuse me, prior to that
2 I was on the Planning Board of East Windsor from
3 about 1970 to 1980. And during my time on the
4 council from '80 to eighty -- in the end of '88, I
5 was active on the Planning Board also.

6 We were very interested in the predecessor of
7 Route 92, which originally was supposed to go from
8 exit 8-A over to Route 206. That -- we were working
9 with mayors and council people and planners in the
10 other townships along the way, and we thought we
11 were making progress when someone up here in
12 Monmouth County or some -- Middlesex decided that
13 they wanted the road up here from exit 8-A over to
14 at least Route 1, should go over to the other side
15 of Princeton actually.

16 This road is very important. We worked on it
17 and we had our alignments made up, but we -- once
18 the road was -- I like to say stolen from us, the
19 rights of way that were being reserved were
20 immediately released and builders built houses in
21 many of the rights of way so that the road couldn't
22 possibly come back there unless we started from
23 scratch again.

24 I think it's very important that this road be
25 built, as I did back in the 1980's. Traffic has

00044

1 gotten no better, and it has gotten considerably
2 less. The people who say that this road will bring
3 more traffic don't recognize the fact that the
4 traffic is going to come anyway. And most of the
5 traffic is here already. What you really want to do
6 is provide a way for the through traffic to get
7 through your community without riding your local
8 roads and congesting your local at-grade
9 intersections.

10 In East Windsor we had Route 132 -- 133 I mean
11 built. We approved that. The Hightstown -- it was
12 the Hightstown Bypass. Although it had the name
13 Hightstown Bypass, it did not run in Hightstown. It
14 ran totally in East Windsor, and we wanted that road
15 because it alleviated traffic in East Windsor,
16 especially at the corner of Route 130 and 571.
17 People coming from or going to Princeton could
18 easily bypass our congested shopping areas and get
19 over to the Turnpike or over to Route 33 and go on
20 down toward the shore area or go north or south on
21 the Turnpike without affecting our local roads.

22 And I think that we were told that the Route
23 92 design and location would also help us and
24 alleviate traffic on Route 571, the Princeton
25 Hightstown Road.

00045

1 At the beginning of my talk if I said that
2 this road was -- that our road was to go to 8-A, it
3 was to go from 8 to Route 206 in Princeton. I'm not
4 sure. I may have misspoken at that point.

5 But I just want to go on record again as being
6 totally in favor of this road. East Windsor people
7 are in favor of this road. I think our council is
8 in favor of this road. And it is important that the
9 road be built.

10 People who are complaining that it will bring
11 noise and pollution I'm afraid are in fear of the
12 bogeyman. They have set up a straw man and they are
13 now trying to use that as a way to stop the road
14 because they're afraid it might bring traffic. But
15 it won't. It will actually alleviate traffic. I'm
16 sure the Hightstown Bypass has brought no traffic
17 into East Windsor or Hightstown. It has relieved us
18 of our problems by having the trucks and the traffic
19 going, as I said before, from the Turnpike or Route
20 33 over in Middlesex coming through and being able
21 to get beyond East Windsor at least or almost beyond
22 East Windsor without affecting our local roads and
23 intersections.

24 The noise and pollution problems were handled
25 in East Windsor. There were people afraid of noise,

00046

1 and sound barriers were put up. To my
2 understanding, there's working very well.

3 So once again, I want to be on record as being
4 totally in favor of this road and hope that you will
5 not be frightened off by people who are raising
6 bogeyman, like the environmental issue which the
7 road was originally moved up to its present location
8 from where it was when it was going by east or
9 through East Windsor was moved up here because at
10 that point you proved that there were fewer or
11 almost no problems with -- with the pollution or
12 many fewer problems with the groundwater basins.
13 Thank you for your attention.

14 Just a P.S. that I had forgotten. This is Len
15 Millner continuing. I'd forgotten to mention that I
16 feel that this roadway will alleviate the terrible
17 traffic congestion on Route 1 and also on Route 130
18 by allowing people to get to the Turnpike without
19 having to travel on those roads if they're coming
20 from the Princeton or even Lawrenceville or North
21 and South Brunswick areas.

22 My daughter now lives in South Brunswick, and
23 when they go to the Turnpike going north, they go up
24 Route 1, and that road is terribly congested all the
25 way to New Brunswick. If this road is built, they

00047

1 would get on in South Brunswick and move unimpeded
2 and without impeding other local traffic to the
3 Turnpike at exit 8-A.

4 Route 130 is also congested. I had to drive
5 my daughter to school -- or my granddaughter to
6 school this past week early in the morning because
7 she was staying with us for a few days, and I'd have
8 to wait two traffic light cycles on Route 130 in
9 order to get through a traffic light to go to the
10 next light and have to wait there.

11 I feel that by getting some of that traffic
12 off of that road -- because a lot of it was coming
13 up toward -- moving north toward Route 32 to get
14 over to the Turnpike. If this road had been built,
15 they wouldn't have been on 130. They would have
16 come right across on 92 right to the Turnpike, and
17 it would have been a wonderful relief of congestion.
18 Thank you.

19 Oh, and the people who are against this road
20 are saying that it will bring more traffic. They
21 don't understand the traffic is here. The traffic
22 will continue to come here. And by getting the
23 through traffic off your local roads, you'll save
24 the local roads from the congestion that they --
25 that they fear. Thanks again for your attention.

00048

1 KATHLEEN PRINTON: My name is Kathleen
2 Printon. It is May 20th, 2004. The time is five
3 ten. And my affiliation is that I'm a Kingston
4 resident for over ten years, and I adamantly oppose
5 Route 92 coming through the historic town of
6 Kingston.

7 I live about four houses off of Laurel Avenue,
8 and I do already hear the trucks from Track Brock
9 driving by, and I can't even imagine the intensity
10 of the noise of our village with all the trucks and
11 excess cars coming off Route 92.

12 I urge you to please reconsider and use Route
13 522, which is a wonderful alternative, a very wide
14 three-lane highway at many points. I -- you know,
15 at this point we're in a deficit to begin with, our
16 state, and I don't think that we need to spend this
17 kind of money on a road that would completely
18 disrupt one small town that has a very historic
19 background. So I just wanted to show my strong
20 opposition to Route 92. Thank you.

21 REGINA POWOROZNEK: My name is Regina
22 Falbow Poworoznek. Today is five twenty. It is
23 seven forty-ish, I think. I'm a home owner. I live
24 in Kingston. And my comment is, I think -- I wish
25 someone had come out and talked to the local

00049

1 truckers that go and use the quarry. If someone
2 goes to the Kingston Deli or to the Main Street Cafe
3 and talks with these people, their suppliers will
4 not give them the extra money to use the Turnpike
5 connection.

6 Therefore, why are you building this just to
7 bring more pollutants into our air, more traffic? I
8 have a child with asthma and I do not appreciate
9 this road coming through. And I will continue to
10 fight it along with my neighbors. Thank you very
11 much.

12 CAROL PASZAMANT: My name is Carol
13 Paszamant. P as in Peter, a-s as in Sam, z as in
14 zebra, a-m as in Mary, a-n as in Nancy, t as in Tom.
15 It's May 20th, 2004 at eight P.M.

16 I am a resident of North Brunswick Township
17 and a lifelong resident of Middlesex County. I'm
18 here to state my opposition to this proposed Route
19 92. I feel that it's a boondoggle that we as
20 taxpayers cannot afford. Trucks may or may not use
21 this once it's built, but in any case, its cost
22 cannot be justified. This proposal will not
23 mitigate sprawl, but increase it. Plainsboro has
24 been counting on this road and has planned or really
25 plotted its course at the detriment of its northern

00050

1 neighbor, South Brunswick. We do not need more
2 roads in this region, we need less development.
3 Thank you.

4 FILOMENA RUSSO: My name is Filomena
5 Russo. It is May 20th at eight fifteen. I live at
6 34 Sycamore place in Kingston. I have been a
7 resident there for 13 years.

8 My biggest concern at this point is that you
9 will not listen to what's been presented to you and
10 that you will not do what I hope is your job, which
11 is to truly and honestly assess all the facts and do
12 the correct thing and not give them a wetland permit
13 and not allow this to continue.

14 We are destroying every possible village that
15 we have in this state. And unfortunately we don't
16 have the power, the money or political wherewithal
17 to fight this. And please restore my faith in the
18 system. Please restore my faith in your job and do
19 the correct thing. Thank you.

20 MARK RODGERS: Yes. My name is Mark
21 Rodgers, R-o-d-g-e-r-s, speaking on behalf of me and
22 my wife Paula Brown, B-r-o-w-n. Today is May 20th.
23 The time is roughly eight o'clock.

24 We are both opposed to the permitting of Route
25 92, the proposed Route 92, on grounds which include

00051

1 the increase in traffic, the increase in water and
2 air pollution and noise pollution that would result,
3 and the increase in cost to the municipalities
4 involved.

5 I commute from Somerset through Deans to
6 Yardville, New Jersey on Route 130 every day, excuse
7 me, five days a week, and I've already experienced
8 the traffic congestion on Route 130. And I'm sure
9 that the Route 1 terminus on exit 8-A would only add
10 to that and worsen it. It's obvious that some of
11 the alternatives, like widening Route 1 or uhm,
12 simply making it illegal for the already illegal
13 truck traffic to travel on local roads might be a
14 way to mitigate the problems instead of constructing
15 this costly boondoggle.

16 So I urge Governor McGreevey and the State
17 Department of Environmental Protection to oppose the
18 Route 92, and my wife feels the same way.

19 RICHARD POWOROZNEK: Okay. My name is
20 Richard Poworoznek. Today is May 20th. The time is
21 eight fifteen, and I'm just representing myself as a
22 concerned citizen.

23 My comments this evening -- and I've been to
24 these hearings probably for the last eight to ten
25 years. The last one that was held on these

00052

1 premises, it was the Holiday Inn, now it's the
2 Radison, at the start of the Environmental Impact
3 Statement. This is such an ill-conceived idea that
4 is being driven by monied interest in Princeton and
5 the surrounding areas. This is not a viable road
6 for any means whatsoever, other than to support the
7 development of the remaining open spaces in
8 Middlesex County.

9 This particular road is going to destroy not
10 only wetlands in the road's path, but it's going to
11 destroy sensitive and historical revolutionary sites
12 through the cross traffic that it's going to create
13 through the Historic Village of Kingston, and from
14 people trying to go back and forth off this road to
15 the western and north-western areas.

16 This is an ill-conceived road as well, because
17 the conceived notion is that people will be willing
18 to pay three dollars and fifty cents to go six
19 miles. Unfortunately, most people will not opt to
20 pay that. It was back in 1993 when the state
21 government increased tolls on the Turnpike that we
22 saw a dramatic increase in the amount of local
23 traffic, including truck traffic, on Route 1. It's
24 not the solution to the problem.

25 The last point I want to bring up is, I

00053

1 understand the Army Corps of Engineers is in the
2 business of building things. Unfortunately, you are
3 quite bias against this particular situation because
4 you really are not looking at the total impact of
5 the road. Your swath of study does not go far
6 enough to the north and to the west, and you're
7 really only concentrating on a small local area.

8 And I hope you're taking into consideration
9 the likely buildouts that will occur as a result of
10 this road. Those buildouts are going to slow
11 traffic even further, and they're not going to
12 increase the traffic flow. Princeton University,
13 who owns a number of acreages near the outlet of
14 this road on Route 1 and down through the Route 1
15 corridor has had a huge money interest in having
16 this road built.

17 The no-exit road that six miles -- it was
18 originally designed for a six-mile road to Route 1,
19 now has planned on at least four and possibly six
20 exits to accommodate the off-ramping onto office
21 parks and other developments planned as a result of
22 this road.

23 We in South Brunswick have been fighting
24 gasoline dealers and gasoline merchants who want to
25 make large investments of gasoline stations for

00054

1 vehicles coming off this road. They would not be
2 wanting to do this unless they felt that this road
3 was going to be built.

4 So at the end of the day, and I want to
5 conclude my comments, is that this road hurts and
6 destroys sensitive wetlands. It will hurt and
7 destroy sensitive historical sites. It does not
8 have, through your analysis, a wider swath of the
9 impact both for traffic and environment. In
10 addition, you're putting an unfair burden on the
11 amount of delivery truck traffic to build this road
12 through the local roads.

13 So on top of the fact that you're allowing
14 this construction to continue, that's technically
15 just a large jobs program for the -- for the
16 construction industry as well as a private driveway
17 to Princeton University future development, you
18 are -- you're in the process of harming the local
19 economy by actually forcing an additional investment
20 of road improvement and maintenance.

21 We have heard additions and large amounts of
22 approximately one to two million dollars of fill
23 that needs to take place to build this road. Well,
24 all that fill has to come to these construction
25 sites through the local roads that you think can't

00055

1 handle traffic today. Well, fortunately they will
2 further not handle traffic to the destruction of
3 those local roads through all this fill delivery
4 that will have to take place.

5 So I hope you will reconsider your decision.
6 I hope the decision will not be granted to issue the
7 permit. I hope that people will understand that
8 environmental protection does not continue with the
9 building of additional roads. It only exacerbates
10 the already fragile situation.

11 The four to five hundred million dollars it
12 will cost to build this road can more than
13 adequately, adequately be spent to improve Route 1
14 and interchange and Dey Road connections that will
15 certainly increase the flow of traffic without this
16 additional situation.

17 Thank you much for your time. I hope you are
18 listening to the people who are coming tonight and
19 not being whitewashed by other ta -- by other
20 interests in this battle. Thank you.

21 WILLIAM FLEMER: My name is William
22 Flemer. I own the property home at 1004 Ridge Road,
23 Kingston, New Jersey. Today is the 20th I believe
24 of May. It's approximately eight thirty P.M. and I
25 would like to speak in opposition to the

00056

1 construction of Route 92 because of the profound
2 negative impact that is sure to result on the Town
3 of Kingston, specifically on Ridge Road where my home
4 is.

5 Ridge Road traffic is already extremely heavy.
6 It's a poorly designed and undersized road for the
7 traffic that already exists, and the possibility to
8 anticipate traffic being dumped on Route 1,
9 westbound traffic and eastbound traffic, it has no
10 other choice. If it wants to continue west or east
11 from the terminus of 92 on Route 1 other than Ridge
12 Road, Raymond Road and other local Kingston Roads,
13 the affect on this would be disastrous for Kingston
14 quality of life and traffic patterns. And it is my
15 understanding that the -- such affects on Kingston
16 are not adequately addressed by the studies that
17 have been taken, performed to date.

18 So I would like to add my voice to the chorus
19 of those opposing the construction of Route 92.
20 Thank you.

21 SUSAN EDELMAN: My name is Susan
22 Edelman. Today is one -- what is it? It's Thursday
23 May 20th, and it is approximately eight thirty P.M.
24 I am a resident of South Brunswick. And I was
25 trying to think of the correct analogy for this

00057

1 road. And finally just a moment ago it popped into
2 my head.

3 If a couple is getting married, they're very
4 much in love, but all of a sudden something changes.
5 They break up. The reason for the wedding is not
6 there anymore. Do people still have a wedding
7 ceremony and reception? No, they do not. And the
8 same thing is true for this road. The reason that
9 this road was going to be built does not exist, so
10 the road should not exist. Thank you.

11 GERI LUONGO: My name is Geri Luongo.
12 It is May 20th at eight fifty P.M. I'm a resident
13 of Kingston.

14 And basically I sat through this afternoon's
15 sessions and this evening I wanted to comment but
16 they're ongoing, so I decided to take this form.

17 After listening to the Plainsboro Officials
18 speaking, it seems very simple. The simplified to
19 me is that they want it, South Brunswick doesn't, so
20 why doesn't the Corps give a -- issue a permit for
21 this 92 to begin in Plainsboro? I mean that would
22 solve all the problems.

23 But basically the issues and the needs
24 surrounding the construction of Route 22 are
25 complicated. They're confusing and somewhat

00058

1 tenuous. As I read past reports and articles and
2 perused documentation, I was further from the
3 rationalization and the reasoning to why Route 22 --
4 Route 92 is needed. I looked for answers to how --
5 and how it would really serve to the best and the
6 highest interests of the people of New Jersey, and
7 more importantly, to the communities and the regions
8 surrounding the proposed project. But I failed to
9 find a viable and responsible answer to this
10 question in any of the documentation.

11 There are many questions and concerns that I
12 would like the new EIS to address. First and
13 foremost is why? How will Route 92 better meet the
14 current and future demands of the area, of the
15 region, and of the region, than the newly
16 constructed Route 522 in the alternate roadways?
17 This access was planned and built just for the
18 purposes of providing an easy access route to New
19 Jersey Turnpike at 8-A and meet future development
20 and growth needs in the area. Why do we need
21 another access only a couple of miles away?

22 Secondly, even if the new EIS determines
23 feasibility for Route 92, why should we build it?
24 Why should we continue the past industrial-type
25 growth trends of highway and roadway development

00059

1 when today, we have the knowledge and technology to
2 do things differently. This knowledge that we can
3 draw upon today, especially considering the past
4 mistakes, the impacts of our past actions. Appoint
5 us accountable and we must be responsible in our
6 planning and construction projects for the future.

7 Just because it can be done and impact studies
8 may be designed to justify it, doesn't make it right
9 for our lifetime or for future generations to come.
10 This type of growth is irresponsible. Just one year
11 ago I moved to the Village of Kingston from Perth
12 Amboy, which is known as the crossroads, because it
13 does have accessibility to the major highways:
14 Route 9, 35, yes, 1, I-287, 440, New Jersey Turnpike
15 and the Garden State Parkway. Perth Amboy has easy
16 access, I must say, and it is convenient to any
17 place you need to drive your automobile. And the
18 multiple choices of roadways provided easy movement
19 for goods via the trucking system.

20 But there are major quality of life issues for
21 everyone living in that area. When two small foster
22 children came to live in our home in Perth Amboy, I
23 considered the area in which we lived. I accepted
24 the responsibility to mother and care for and
25 protect these children and to do what was in their

00060

1 best interests.

2 After 25 years of living with truck and
3 automobile congestion, we moved to Kingston for what
4 I thought would be space, freedom, ability to walk
5 safely, and a better place to raise our children.
6 However, I soon discovered that Kingston was already
7 in trouble.

8 As a resident I picked up mail from my post
9 office -- post box at the post office located on
10 Route 27. When walking to the post office with my
11 four-year old daughter, I was astounded by the
12 traffic which sped in both directions on the narrow
13 roadway of Academy. We have to carefully maneuver
14 crossing the road to walk to the post office.
15 Academy and Ridge Roads are used as pass-through
16 roads. And the congestion now is more than these
17 old time country roads ever were thought to have to
18 bear.

19 I can't even imagine encouraging more through
20 traffic on these roads with the construction and
21 convenience of Route 92. The impact in this area
22 has not been addressed and is well beyond the study.

23 Since the roads that connect west and east run
24 right through Kingston, this is a vital point that
25 must be thoroughly taken under consideration when

00061

1 the new EIS is done. These roadways are extremely
2 narrow. They're old country roads. They cannot
3 endure much more traffic. It is very difficult to
4 turn out on Euclid eastwardly onto Academy in a
5 standard sized automobile or a mini-van because you
6 must go into two lanes of traffic to make the turn.
7 Many times I'm stuck waiting for the Route 27
8 traffic light to change and both lanes of the
9 roadway to be clear so I can pull out of my own
10 neighborhood street.

11 The small neighborhood access roads must also
12 be included in this study. You don't need any type
13 of engineering degree, planning degree to know that
14 the construction of Route 92 is wrong. Just because
15 of financial interests of economic growth of
16 Plainsboro or Princeton University, it is wrong to
17 do this to the people in the area. And I think that
18 you really need to listen to what the people need.
19 Please do not issue the permit. Thank you.

20 TRACEY POST-ZWICKER: My name is Tracey
21 Post-Zwicker. P-o-s-t hyphen Z-w-i-c-k-e-r. It's
22 May 20th, 2004, nine thirty P.M. I'm a resident of
23 Kingston, New Jersey, and I just want to say I
24 oppose Route 92, I think for all the reasons that
25 have been stated at the hearing. Personally, it

00062

1 will have an incredible negative impact on my
2 quality of life and that of my family's. I think we
3 need to be more creative, find a better solution,
4 and I urge the Army Corps to do that work. Thank
5 you.

6 ROBERT GERAGHTY: My name is Robert
7 Geraghty. It's five twenty, 2004. It is now
8 approximately nine forty. I am a resident of South
9 Brunswick. I have been a resident of South
10 Brunswick for forty years. And I'd just like to
11 pass one comment on, that it's almost ludicrous to
12 think that 522 is not a major consideration for what
13 an east/west corridor should be. The road is
14 already there. And to put in 92 to parallel 522 is
15 a huge waste of funds and absolutely not necessary.
16 Thank you.

17 MADELON STEWART: Good evening. This
18 is Madelon Stewart. It's Thursday, May 20th, 2004,
19 and it's 20 minutes of ten.

20 I'm affiliated with PRIDE, which is an
21 organization of home owners in the Raymond Road
22 area. There are about two hundred houses, so almost
23 three hundred adults and more children.

24 We're very, very concerned about Route 92. We
25 believe that it will negatively impact traffic on

00063

1 Raymond Road. But that's not the only reason we're
2 concerned about it. We think that there needs to be
3 regional planning to alleviate the kind of
4 congestion that we have in our area, and we are
5 absolutely, vehemently for having -- convening a
6 round table, such as they convened for the Millstone
7 Bypass, to resolve some of these issues.

8 South Brunswick has Route 522, and certainly
9 Plainsboro has Schalks Crossing Road, which connects
10 up with Dey Road and which would make another
11 east/west connector, and we believe that a network
12 of roads east/west is the way to go.

13 And I believe that what this will do will only
14 bring more trucks to Route 1, which is not what any
15 of us want. Thank you very much.

16 A VOICE: May 20th, 2004.
17 The time is nine fifty P.M. No affiliation. I'm a
18 citizen of Plainsboro.

19 My comments are thus: Even though Plainsboro
20 Township voted in favor of this highway, I am not in
21 favor of the highway. I'm not an engineer. I'm not
22 an environmental analyst. I have been involved in
23 analyses and the studies of business nature in the
24 past and I know that a logical approach is also
25 best, but there are some times when you need to

00064

1 bring in some common sense. And my common sense
2 tells me a few things. Number one, being a resident
3 of this area for oh, about 21 years, or Central
4 Jersey and Plainsboro in particular, I know that
5 truck drivers on the Turnpike like to beat the tolls
6 as much as they can. And one of the ways they do
7 that in the northeast corridor is by jumping off the
8 Turnpike and going down Route 1 and jumping onto 95
9 and going further on down into the Washington area,
10 Baltimore, down into Florida.

11 92 would only give them an additional chance
12 to jump off the Turnpike and beat some tolls, jump
13 onto Route 1, go right down 95 a short distance,
14 five miles or so, whatever it is, jump onto 95,
15 which is a free route all the way into the
16 southeast. We certainly don't need any more traffic
17 on Route 1 because it's not designed to handle the
18 amount that it has now.

19 I'd also like to say regarding east/west
20 alleviation of traffic concerning Route 92, which
21 was its original function, whether it was fifty,
22 sixty years ago, but addressing that concern, again,
23 I think a bit of common sense seems to apply.

24 I was wondering what all the fuss was about
25 with the traffic east/west in Plainsboro, so one

00065

1 morning I took some time at rush hour and went down
2 around -- oh, I guess about eight, eight fifteen,
3 somewhere in that range, to Princeton Meadow
4 Shopping Center, which is on Plainsboro Road, and I
5 drove with the traffic. And there was a bit of
6 traffic. I drove with the traffic up to Schalks
7 Crossing Road where it broke, and it took me all of
8 about five minutes when the trip would normally take
9 perhaps about -- oh, I don't know, one or two
10 minutes.

11 It seems to me that a few minutes extra time
12 on everybody's part that travels that road isn't
13 enough to spend three hundred or four hundred
14 million dollars just to cut off a few minutes travel
15 time through the -- the most traffic part of
16 Plainsboro. Those are my comments. Thank you very
17 much.

18 EDMUND LUCIANO: My name is Ed Luciano.
19 Today's date is May the 20th. The time is ten
20 twenty-eight on Thursday evening. My affiliation is
21 not only as a South Brunswick Township resident, but
22 also as a councilman. I have been the Mayor, the
23 Former Mayor, Deputy Mayor, been on the Council,
24 been on Planning Board and been on the Zoning Boards
25 I guess with an affiliation of over ten or fifteen

00066

1 years. So I'm somewhat familiar with the planning
2 process and so forth.

3 Several questions that I have, and I spoke
4 about these a little bit earlier this evening, and
5 I'll start with them in order. They may not be the
6 order that I spoke at the podium.

7 Number one: Everyone seems to be concerned
8 with sprawl, but if you were to look at the Route 1
9 corridor, and especially between New Brunswick and
10 down to Quaker Bridge through Plainsboro, you will
11 see the sprawl not only with townhomes and condos,
12 but also with commercial building, office building,
13 office research development.

14 A lot of the homes that lie behind the office
15 research area on Route 1 were purchased by the
16 people who work in those buildings along Route 1.
17 The sprawl is already there, and it's a promise that
18 Route 92 would be built. So even before it became a
19 reality, the planning process in neighboring
20 Plainsboro, going down to the Windsors and south of
21 us, was to build up those areas along Route 1
22 anticipating that there would be relief from Route
23 92.

24 So my question for the most part is, where has
25 the traffic patterns come from now that we know the

00067

1 development of those areas, past, present and what
2 the future is? Has anyone looked at the sprawl, the
3 additional sprawl and the additional traffic? And
4 that traffic would be coming off of Route 1 north
5 and south.

6 The second question that I do have deals with
7 the residual environmental damage that during the
8 construction of the Route 92, the wetlands that are
9 immediately surrounding that area, they will be
10 damaged and they will be affecting in the wildlife
11 as well as any wetlands that are in that particular
12 area.

13 Speaking of wetlands, from what I understand
14 there has never been a successful wetlands built to
15 the tune of I think what we're looking at -- the
16 Turnpike is proposing the construction of a 57 acre
17 wetland north and south of the proposed alignment
18 east of High Press Road. I would like to know where
19 in New Jersey has a reconstructed wetlands of such
20 size been located, and how long ago and what stage
21 of life is it in? And is it considered to be
22 successful or not? Because if the 57 acres of
23 wetlands is going to be used to justify the removal
24 of natural wetlands, we should have some degree of
25 confidence and proof that the 57 acre wetland will

00068

1 survive.

2 So I would like to know, questions as to is
3 there one of that size and scope in New Jersey?
4 Where is it? How old is it? And is it a success or
5 not? The Corps has commented once before that they
6 have not had one of this size to -- to examine. So
7 how could they have put remarks in the DEIS on a
8 wetlands construction that they don't have any --
9 any experience with?

10 I'm also concerned that during the building of
11 Route 92 there's going to be large vehicles.
12 They'll be diesel engines most likely. They will be
13 giving out diesel particulates. These diesel
14 vehicles also drip a lot of oil, hydraulic oil and
15 grease and so forth, and I'm concerned about the
16 affect of the aquifers that are in the area. That
17 also was not tended to by the DEIS.

18 So I would like to know what is going to be
19 the impact of the aquifers as a result of these
20 large vehicles moving dirt and stone and concrete
21 around disturbing the area to build Route 92.

22 The third comment that I have is I'd like to
23 know the study that was done using the South
24 Brunswick Township Master Plan. I'd like to know,
25 A, if the Army Corps was aware that there was a

00069

1 South Brunswick Traffic Master Plan and a Growth
2 Master Plan. Because we do have DEIS studies, and
3 we, for the most part, layer by layer can
4 reconstruct South Brunswick Township, and nowhere in
5 the DIS does it mention that. I would like to know
6 why not. And if they did not know that existed, I
7 would like them to use the DIS, and then to revise
8 their findings regarding aquifer damage and wetland
9 damage and recharging and so forth, having that
10 particular information available to them.

11 Also, the roadway situation, the travel -- the
12 master plan dealing with the travelling and of the
13 roads. The DEIS has taken into account nothing
14 regarding intersection improvements and so forth to
15 move traffic in and around South Brunswick Township.
16 It also took nothing into account in the South
17 Brunswick Township Traffic Master Plan that talked
18 about traffic.

19 Most of the traffic in South Brunswick is
20 passing through South Brunswick to go to the north
21 and to go to the south. The primary reason why we
22 have so many trailers on Route 1 going south or
23 going north is because they get off at 9-A, which is
24 close to one, and they take that all the way down to
25 where they can hit 95 or 295 and save the toll.

00070

1 So I'd like to know why the Army Corps would
2 believe that that mind set would change and that
3 the -- the truck drivers as well as the drive -- car
4 drivers would pay an additional toll coming off of
5 the Turnpike to go six point seven miles when they
6 avoid the toll up around exit 9-A in New Brunswick.

7 So I'm concerned about the traffic study,
8 where they got their numbers from and what was taken
9 into account as to why Route 1 traffic was growing
10 as it has, and did it take into account that the
11 growth has been such ever since there's been a -- a
12 toll increase.

13 Furthermore, on Route 1 going north and south,
14 has it been taken into account that right where 92
15 will be dumped, it's still a two-lane highway. My
16 question would be, why would you take an already
17 congested highway system, add the additional traffic
18 that's stated in the DEIS onto -- onto Route 1
19 and -- Route 1 north and south.

20 The situation is you're going to -- you're
21 just going to exasperate the Route 1 traffic problem
22 in and around that entire area. So before 92 is
23 built, I believe that there needs to be many, many
24 improvements in the local areas, the intersections
25 and so forth. And of course, Route 1 needs to be

00071

1 widened to at least four lanes, with the one lane
2 being used to get on and off or get in and out of
3 the corporate parks that are planned and those that
4 are in existence.

5 Route 522 and Route 133, they do exist
6 currently. They are two major east/west roadway
7 systems. Route -- South Brunswick Township has
8 built Route 522 and it's a four-lane road, and it
9 runs east/west. It runs actually from Cranbury Road
10 all the way through to Route 27.

11 I'd like to know why the DEIS did not study
12 the cost and the alternative of hooking the Turnpike
13 up with 522 down near Cranbury Road and use that as
14 the east/west artery. I believe that should be
15 studied, not only from environmental areas, but as
16 well as the financial areas and the disturbance
17 areas, as well as the traffic-flow areas.

18 Also, I'm very concerned about the cost. A
19 bond came out at three -- a hundred and fifty
20 million. I believe that that bond has been
21 exhausted. By my own estimates, I believe that the
22 cost of this enterprise is going to be over one
23 billion dollars to build a six point seven mile
24 roadway that will be tolled. It will have a toll
25 coming off the Turnpike and a toll coming off of 92

00072

1 to access Route 1. I do not believe people are
2 going to take advantage of that roadway because of
3 the toll. And according to the studies, I do not
4 believe also that there's going to be a savings of
5 time as was indicated in the study.

6 So therefore, I would like to have a study
7 that would show the time savings between using 522
8 and 133 verses using Route 92. And 522 is a
9 four-lane road that's free, as is 133.

10 So I believe we need to know, will an access
11 to 522 off the Turnpike change the character of the
12 traffic? And if it will, how would it compare it to
13 92? And in fact, would 522 and 133 be a less costly
14 alternative and a more efficient alternative to
15 Route 92? Route 522 would provide access from the
16 north and Route 133 would provide access from the
17 south.

18 So in my final point that I would like to make
19 regarding the money issue. We know three hundred
20 and fifty million was on the first bond. I believe
21 that this entire project is going to cost one
22 billion dollars or more. My concern is simply that
23 that one billion dollars, if we did a study, we can
24 take the balance of what it would cost to link up
25 522 and use that to improve the local roadway

00073

1 systems so that there would be easier access east
2 and west to Route 1.

3 I would also pose a question as to why there
4 wasn't a study and a strong recommendation that
5 Route 1 be widened to four lanes before 92 ever is
6 built. And I think the most important questions
7 here that has not been addressed, is simply that of
8 environmental conditions regarding the aquifers,
9 regarding the wetlands, regarding the air quality,
10 because during the building of Route 92 and after
11 the building of 92, car fumes and diesel
12 particulates will be affecting I believe the quality
13 of the food that is being grown in active farms that
14 currently lie along the Route 92 alignment.

15 So I do believe that the DEIS has left a
16 number of questions unanswered. And I believe that
17 they should be answered, should be addressed. This
18 way we can get a total picture as to is 522 and 133
19 the alternative that links both highways, that links
20 the Turnpike to Route 1, and a far less cost than
21 what's proposed from the Turnpike?

22 And, I also would say that in terms of the
23 highway, Route 92 is going to be elevated maybe
24 fifteen feet or more. That elevation is nowhere in
25 any of the Local Townships. So South Brunswick

00074

1 Township, predominately a farming community and a
2 residential community, now will start to look more
3 like Elizabeth, New Jersey than it does in our
4 Master Plan.

5 So my question is, was our Master Plan Read?
6 Was it taken into consideration? How was it
7 applied? And what were the conclusions drawn as to
8 the total impact of 92 on traffic, on environmental,
9 on aquifers, and on the local roads, yes, and the
10 impact on the local road systems.

11 I believe that the cost and all the other
12 factors will make 522 the better alternative. So
13 what we need is a full-blown study of an alternative
14 to 92, which is 522. That has not been done. I'd
15 like to know why it hasn't been done. Because 522
16 was known to be built, and it's one year away from
17 being completed to Cranbury Road, and why that
18 cannot be used to connect it to the Turnpike.

19 I believe that road will provide the relief
20 that's seen and needed, because I do believe that
21 the north/south traffic is going to increase just as
22 a nature of growth in the Township, 92, which is
23 only exasperated down where it meets Route 1.

24 These are my comments. If you need to reach
25 me, my home phone is (732)297-2234 and my office

00075

1 phone is (732)777-3644. I know I ramble a bit, but
2 you know what my questions are and it's late, so
3 forgive me for rambling. Thank you.

4 (Whereupon, the tape concludes.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

00076

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, MARIA GEORGELES, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New
Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a
true and accurate transcript of the stenographic
notes of the tape-recorded proceeding as taken by
me, in the above entitled matter on the date and
place hereinbefore set forth.

MARIA GEORGELES, C.S.R.

